

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

13²9 -4

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
S. 50
A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE
OF HAWAII INTO THE UNION

FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1959

STATEMENT OF WILLIS A. CARTO, SECRETARY, LIBERTY LOBBY, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., IN OPPOSITION TO HAWAIIAN ADMISSION

When the income tax (10th) amendment was passed, its promoters solemnly promised that it would never take more than 2 or 3 percent of the income of any taxpayer. However, a precedent had been established with its passage. That precedent was that it became possible for Congress, by majority vote, to confiscate up to 100 percent of a man's income if it desired to do so. Forty-six years later we realize this truth. Few realized it in 1913. A prophet then would have been ridiculed.

The admission of Hawaii would establish another precedent. This precedent would be that land or islands unconnected with the American Continent and inhabited by people of radically differing backgrounds from the majority of Americans are eligible to become a State.

Gentlemen, this is a road with no ending. This is the road to world government. It is the highway through the gradual watering down of the idea of American nationality and nationhood to a meaningless, characterless, cosmopolitan universality. It is a violence to American sovereignty. It is suicide.

There is a question which American statesmen must come to grips with before it is too late. After Hawaii, what? Puerto Rico? Panama? Guam? The Virgin Islands? Why not, then, Ghana? Or San Marino? Reasons can be found for the admission of all of these. What is the point at which we stop?

Many of the people of these countries desire to become an American State. The Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marin, does. Immediately after Congress passed Alaskan admittance, he wired to the Governor of Alaska:

"My sincerest congratulations to the Alaskan people for this victory in getting statehood through the principle of self-determination. The people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, who also benefited from this principle, wish the people of Alaska lots of happiness in their new status."

Governor Marin apparently is not only in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico but he believes that it is a matter of right if it is desired by the people of Puerto Rico.

The admission of a new State is a serious matter. It is not properly a matter of emotion nor of wishful thinking. Nor is it a matter of "earning," for statehood is not a reward, to be presented as a proud parent would give an all-day sucker to a well-behaved child.

Admission must always be a matter of principle. This principle is that the issue requires calm deliberation in the light of national interest. There can be no other approach to the matter without disaster. Statesmen must calmly decide that admission of an area is in the national interest or opposed to it, and this is the sole criterion. Only national interest is concerned. This and nothing else.

Hawaiian statehood clearly has nothing to recommend it as far as this Nation's interests are concerned and each and every argument brought forth for it is specious when viewed in the clear light of national interest.

For instance, one of the arguments is that admission is necessary for national security. This is an obvious fiction. The same was said for Alaska, but after Congress favored Alaska the Washington magazine, U.S. News & World Report, revealed that opposition from high military officials was one of the factors which had slowed down its march through Congress. Now one does not need to be a military genius to perceive that a territory is much easier controlled in the event of national emergency than is a sovereign state.

Another argument is that the step of statehood has been promised by the officials of two political parties. But, gentlemen, only Congress can promise the will of the Nation, and Congress has made no promise. It is only in totalitarian states, like Communist Russia or Nazi Germany, that a political party can make promises in the name of the government.

In addition to the question of national interest there is a very important constitutional issue involved. Admission of Hawaii, to be legal, would clearly require an amendment to the Constitution, without which Congress would be acting devoid of its constitutional power to so act, and admission would be null and void. Let me read the appropriate portion of the Constitution, the preamble:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the General Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is where we derive the name of our country, and the name is the "United States of America."

The 20 volcanic islands in the North Pacific Ocean making up Hawaii are not part of the American Continent. This is a geographical fact.

To properly admit Hawaii would require a constitutional amendment changing the name of this Nation to, perhaps, the "United States of America and the North Pacific Ocean," or to the "United States of Anywhere." The latter would probably be preferable because we could then retain the initials "U.S.A."

We are in danger of making a cataclysmic turn in American history. We are at the point where we may remain a Republic with clearly defined boundaries or soon become a meaningless conglomeration, an "empire" if you like the term, with our boundaries and our voting electorate changing with the whims of pressure groups and the cast of fortune.

I do not begrudge Hawaiians the right to petition for admission. It is their right to do so and I, as a citizen of the Nation they admire, am flattered at their high opinion of my country. But I protest at the insane hysteria which has been excited in Congress by the lobbyists who are promoting this for their own selfish ends. This hysteria is a totally artificial thing, uncondemned to calm discussion and inimical to the best interests of the country. Is Congress really going to capitulate so easily to the wiles of the professional pressure artists and the venality of tawdry political "deals"? What has happened to statesmanship?

A certain Senator's legislative assistant—a very capable gentleman—has protested at my accusation that lobbyists have whipped up this hysteria. He has said that he doubts if there are any such lobbyists. I prefer to believe differently. I find it impossible to believe that this mysterious clamor for admission—a step obviously detrimental to our long-range interests—is spontaneous. I have more respect for the collective intelligence of Congress than to believe otherwise.

In spite of the fact that Hawaiian admission has been before Congress for 10 years, I submit that the discussion of this grave step has heretofore always been in the realm of partisan politics or idle chatter about the imagined wishes or welfare of the Hawaiians and never—repeat, never—in the realm of true national interest. This is why I doubt if all of the honorable Senators have had the opportunity to understand the import of the step.

I pray that the honorable Senators will allow themselves to stand away from the hurly-burly of partisan politics long enough to perceive the true road ahead—the one leading safely through the tempest of pressure and misinformation which blows so loudly around them. I address my plea to those lonely men—those statesmen who are able to stand against the wind when they see it blowing in a perverse direction.

AMERICAN LEGION,
PERROTTET-NICKERSON Post No. 76,
Wheaton, Ill., February 24, 1959.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We are absolutely opposed to the admission of Hawaii or any other group to our U.S. citizenship that are located far from our mainland.

Other objections to the admission of Hawaii as a State, are:

- (1) Its manner of life is far different, as a whole, to that of ours.
- (2) A vast proportion of its inhabitants are communistic or favorable thereto,
- (3) Hawaii is dominated by arbitrary unionism.
- (4) Hawaii is Celestial in origin. While it is proper to admit Celestials in small numbers at a time to citizenship, we cannot expect to absorb them in great masses, particularly when they are so far from our mainland.
- (5) Protection of Hawaii would add a large cost to our country and lead to much "entanglement."

Let's covet and keep our Constitution strong. This applies to all citizens including our apparently weak Supreme Court.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD J. KUNZE,
Past Commander.